

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-22 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 9, and 16 have been amended. Support for the amendments is throughout the specification and particularly in paragraphs [0020] through [0026].

The Office Action rejected claims 1-22 under 102(e) as being anticipated by Cunningham et al. (United States Patent Publication No. 2006/0064412) (hereinafter “Cunningham”).

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Cunningham does not teach or suggest selectively activating one or more underlying operations for the UDT, as required by amended independent claims 1, 9, and 16. While Cunningham teaches “inheritance, in which a type can be extended with an additional method to create a new type,” paragraph [0070], it does not teach or suggest that method associated with the old type (the underlying operations of claims 1, 9, and 16) can be selectively activated for the new type.

Therefore, amended independent claims 1, 9, and 16 are not anticipated by Cunningham. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn in light of the amendment. The remaining dependent claims (i.e., claims 2-8, 10-15, and 17-22) depend from one of claims 1, 9, and 16 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as described above.

**SUMMARY**

Applicant contends that the claims are in condition for allowance, which action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Howard L. Speight/

Howard L. Speight

Reg. No. 37,733

9601 Katy Freeway

Suite 280

Houston, Texas 77024

(713) 881-9600 (phone)

(713) 715-7384 (facsimile)

howard@hspeight.com

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

Date: August 27, 2007